



UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY

A PSYCHOMETRIC EXAMINATION OF THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL WORK ETHIC PROFILE AMONG AIR FORCE ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Michael J. Miller
David J. Woehr

Department of Psychology
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4235

Winston Bennett, Jr.

HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS DIRECTORATE
MISSION CRITICAL SKILLS DIVISION
7909 Lindbergh Drive
Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5352

19991004 065

February 1998

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS DIRECTORATE
7909 Lindbergh Drive
Brooks Air Force Base, TX 78235-5352

NOTICES

This report is published in the interest of scientific and technical information exchange and does not constitute approval or disapproval of its ideas or findings.

Using Government drawings, specifications, or other data included in this document for any purpose other than Government-related procurement does not in any way obligate the US Government. The fact that the Government formulated or supplied the drawings, specifications, or other data, does not license the holder or any other person or corporation, or convey any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may relate to them.

The Office of Public Affairs has reviewed this paper, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information Service, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This report has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

**WINSTON BENNETT, JR
Project Scientist**

**R. BRUCE GOULD
Acting Chief
Mission Critical Skills Division**

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)			2. REPORT DATE February 1998		3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Interim Report - June 1997-August 1997		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Psychometric Examination of the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile Among Air Force Enlisted Personnel			5. FUNDING NUMBERS PE- 62202F PR- 1123 TA- A2 WU 19				
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael J. Miller David J. Woehr			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Department of Psychology Texas A&M University College Station, TX 77843-4235			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER AFRL-HE-BR-TP-1998-0113				
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Research Laboratory Human Effectiveness Directorate Mission Critical Skills Division 7909 Lindbergh Drive Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5352			11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Air Force Research Laboratory Technical Monitor: Dr. Winston Bennett, Jr. (480) 988-6561, DSN 474-6297				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited				12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE			
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) The present study presents an examination of the psychometric properties of the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) developed by Michael Miller and David Woehr (Miller & Woehr, 1997; Woehr & Miller, 1997). The MWEP is a multidimensional measure of work ethics based on previous research and literature focusing on work ethic and job performance. Originally developed based on a sample of university students, the MWEP has demonstrated good psychometric characteristics including convergent and discriminant validity. The MWEP has been suggested as a potentially valuable screening tool with Air Force enlisted personnel. The purpose of the present study was to provide a preliminary evaluation of the measure among Air Force enlisted personnel. Results indicate that the measure does in fact demonstrate similar psychometric characteristics among Air Force enlisted personnel as with the original development sample. The MWEP provides reliable and valid measures of multiple dimensions underlying the work ethic construct. These results indicate that the MWEP may be a useful screening tool for Air Force personnel.						15. NUMBER OF PAGES 16	
14. SUBJECT TERMS Job Performance; Screening Tools; Work Ethic; Work Measures; Psychometrics; Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile; MWEP						16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED		18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED		19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED		20. LIMITATION ABSTRACT UL	

Table of Contents

NOTICES.....	iv
PREFACE.....	v
SUMMARY.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHOD.....	6
RESULTS.....	6
DISCUSSION.....	10
FUTURE RESEARCH.....	11
REFERENCES.....	12

PREFACE

The views and opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policies or opinions of their respective organizations.

The authors wish to thank the United States Air Force personnel that participated in this project, for these scientific advances would not be possible without their support and cooperation. The authors would also like to thank Kathleen Sheehan for preparing the final format of this report.

SUMMARY

The present study presents an examination of the psychometric properties of the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) developed by Michael Miller and David Woehr (Miller & Woehr, 1997; Woehr & Miller, 1997). The MWEP is a multidimensional measure of work ethic based on previous research and literature focusing on work ethic and job performance. Originally developed based on a sample of university students, the MWEP has demonstrated good psychometric characteristics including reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. The MWEP has been suggested as a potentially valuable screening tool with Air Force enlisted personnel. The purpose of the present study was to provide a preliminary evaluation of the measure among Air Force enlisted personnel. Results indicate that the measure does in fact demonstrate similar psychometric characteristics among Air Force enlisted personnel as with the original developmental sample. The MWEP provides reliable and valid measures of multiple dimensions underlying the work ethic construct. These results indicate that the MWEP may be a useful screening tool for Air Force Personnel.

AN PSYCHOMETRIC EXAMINATION OF THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL WORK ETHIC PROFILE AMONG AIR FORCE ENLISTED PERSONNEL

INTRODUCTION

History and Definition of Work Ethic

The term "work ethic" was coined centuries ago by post-Reformation intellectuals who opposed the practice of social welfare and professed the importance of individualism (Byrne, 1990). They espoused the belief that human beings must assume full responsibility for their lot in life and the poor were no exception. As such, hard work was viewed as a panacea and through it, one could improve his or her condition in life. Implicit in this assumption was the belief that the poor simply needed to help themselves through diligent labor and all life's ills would vanish. Such were the harsh origins of the construct.

Modern formulations of the work ethic construct stem from the work of the German scholar Max Weber. It was in 1904 and 1905 that Weber wrote a two-part essay entitled "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism". In this essay Weber advanced the thesis that the introduction and rapid expansion of capitalism and the resulting industrialization in Western Europe and North America was in part the result of the Puritan value of asceticism (i.e., scrupulous use of time, strict self-denial of luxury, worldly pleasure, ease, and so on to achieve personal discipline) and the belief in a calling from God (Byrne, 1990; Charlton, Mallinson, & Oakeshott, 1986; Fine, 1983; Furnham, 1990a; Green, 1968; Lehmann, 1993; Maccoby, 1983; Nord, Brief, Atieh, & Doherty, 1988; Poggi, 1983). It was the practice of asceticism that Weber believed produced the celebrated 'work ethic'--the complete and relentless devotion to one's economic role on earth (Lessnoff, 1994). An individual's economic role was prescribed by the belief in a calling (Gilbert, 1977). The manifestation of occupational rewards through success in one's calling came to be revered as a sign of being one of the elect (i.e., chosen by God to receive salvation). Thus, economic activity was a vehicle toward economic success and economic success was a sign of salvation.

Weber maintained that other Protestant faiths (e.g., Calvinism, Methodism, Pietism, and Baptists) shared common theological underpinnings in terms of being proponents of asceticism and the spirit of capitalism (Bouma, 1973; Nelson, 1973); thus the term "Protestant Work Ethic" (PWE). However, the premise that work ethic is a religiously oriented concept was contested then and since. In fact, researchers have found little relationship between religious orientation and endorsement of the work ethic (Giorgi & Marsh, 1990; Ray, 1982). Ray (1982) concluded that all religious orientations currently share the attributes associated with the work ethic to the same degree. He states that the Protestant ethic, "...is certainly not yet dead; it is just no longer Protestant" (p. 135). This is consistent with Pascarella's (1984) contention that all major religions have espoused the importance of work. Thus, it appears that what was originally conceived as a religious construct is now likely secular and is best viewed as general work ethic

and not the PWE.

Since the work ethic is not a surrogate for religious orientation the question becomes, What is it? Current conceptualizations tend to view the work ethic as an attitudinal construct pertaining to work oriented values. An individual espousing a high work ethic would place great value on: hard work, autonomy, fairness, wise and efficient use of time, delay of gratification, and the intrinsic value of work (Cherrington, 1980; Dubin, 1963; Furnham, 1984; Ho & Lloyd, 1984; Weber, 1958; Wollack, Goodale, Wijting, & Smith, 1971). Therefore, work ethic seems to be made up of multiple components. These components appear to include: industriousness, asceticism, self-reliance, morality, delay of gratification, and the centrality of work. In the absence of a firmly accepted conceptual and operational definition it is posited that work ethic is a construct that reflects a constellation of attitudes and beliefs pertaining to work oriented behavior. Characteristics of "work ethic" are that it: (a) is multidimensional; (b) pertains to work and work related activity in general, not specific to any particular job (yet may generalize to domains other than work - school, hobbies, etc.); (c) is learned (not dispositional); (d) refers to attitudes and beliefs (not necessarily behavior); (e) is intended as a motivational construct (should be reflected in behavior); and (e) is secular, not necessarily tied to any one set of religious beliefs.

Relevance of Work Ethic to the Air Force

As previously defined, individual differences in work ethic should reflect differences among individuals in terms of their attitudes and beliefs with respect to the value of work and work-related behavior. An important consideration for industrial psychology is the relationship between these attitudes and beliefs and actual work behavior. While industrial psychologists interested in the work ethic have typically explored its relationship with other attitudinal variables such as job satisfaction (e.g., Aldag & Brief, 1975; Blood, 1969; Stone, 1975, 1976; Wanous, 1974), job involvement (e.g., Blau, 1987; Randall & Cote, 1991; Saal, 1978), and organizational commitment (e.g., Kidron, 1978; Morrow & McElroy, 1987), there have been relatively few studies (e.g., Khaleque, 1992; Orpen, 1986), focusing on the relationship of work ethic with actual job performance. A possible reason for this is the lack of distinction between task and contextual aspects of job performance.

Recently several models of job performance have been proposed which attempt to describe a set of underlying dimensions that are representative of performance in all jobs (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993; Campbell, 1990; Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager, 1993). For example, Campbell (1990) argues that all jobs are made up of eight factors, including: job-specific task proficiency, non-job-specific task proficiency, written and oral communication, demonstrating effort, maintaining personal discipline, facilitating team and peer performance, supervision and leadership, and management and administration. Campbell's formulation distinguishes between behaviors that contribute to organizational effectiveness through their focus on task proficiency and those behaviors that help the organization in other ways (Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). Task proficiency behaviors are formally prescribed by the

organization whereas other behaviors, though not formally a part of the job, are still very valuable for organizational effectiveness (Borman & Motowidlo, 1993).

Borman and Motowidlo (1993) place performance behaviors not prescribed by the organization under the rubric of contextual activities. Examples include:

- (1) Volunteering to carry out task activities that are not formally a part of the job.
- (2) Persisting with extra enthusiasm or effort when necessary to complete own task activities successfully.
- (3) Helping and cooperating with others.
- (4) Following organizational rules and procedures even when personally inconvenient.
- (5) Endorsing, supporting, and defending organizational objectives. (p. 73)

Using a sample comprising Air Force mechanics, Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) demonstrated that supervisors consider task performance and contextual performance separately when providing performance ratings. It is the contextual component of job performance in which work ethic may offer substantial predictive utility. Specifically, it may be possible to predict with a measure of work ethic the extent to which an individual would engage in contextual performance of value to the unit. Further, the work ethic may demonstrate a relationship with technical school training success, job performance, and tenure in the Air Force.

Measurement of Work Ethic

Of paramount concern for research focusing on the understanding of the work ethic construct as well as the relationship between work ethic and work behavior is the ability to accurately measure the construct. There are at least seven work ethic measures in existence which purport to provide reliable and valid measures of this construct. However, there are a number of problems with these measures. First and foremost, they focus on the measurement of a single construct by providing a global "work ethic" score. This is a considerable shortcoming as, since its inception, Weber believed the work ethic to be a multidimensional construct; a position that has subsequently been supported by numerous researchers (Bouma, 1973; Cherrington, 1980; Furnham, 1984; Oates, 1971).

From a psychometric as well as a conceptual perspective, the lack of focus on the multidimensional nature of the work ethic is troubling. The use of a single overall score could potentially cause the loss of information with regards to the different components of work ethic as well as their relationships with other constructs (Carver, 1989; McHoskey, 1994). Further, the use of a single score in studies using different instruments to measure the work ethic may at least partially explain the equivocal results often found in the literature (Furnham, 1984). That is, one cannot be sure if the conflicting results are due to a lack of robustness in the studies, the scales measuring different components of the work ethic, or deficiencies in terms of construct relevance and psychometric properties (Furnham, 1990b).

A second concern is that the various measures appear to tap different components of the work ethic and not the construct in its entirety. This has often lead to poor intercorrelations among measures. For example, Furnham (1990b) administered seven measures of the work ethic to 1,021 participants and found that the correlations between the various measures ranged from 0.19 - 0.66 with a mean r of 0.36. One would expect the values to be much higher if the scales were indeed measuring the same thing.

Finally, another potential problem with existing work ethic measures is that these measures are relatively dated. The mean time since publication for the previous measures is 23 years. The age of the measures poses the problem of many dated items. For example, some of the items contain sex-biased language such as: "Hard work makes a man a better person", "The man who can approach an unpleasant task with enthusiasm is the man who gets ahead", and "To be superior a man must stand alone".

Factor analytic investigations of the various measures have found the existence of several identifiable factors (Furnham, 1990b; Heaven, 1989; Tang, 1993; Mirels & Garrett, 1971; McHoskey, 1994). For example, McHoskey (1994) factor analyzed Mirels and Garrett's Protestant Ethic scale. His analysis yielded a 4-factor solution, which he labeled, "success", "asceticism", "hard-work", and "anti-leisure". However, McHoskey was quick to point out that though this scale was multidimensional, other important aspects of the PWE were absent. Specifically, it in no way measured an individual's attitudes toward morality, self-reliance, or delay of gratification. This lack of comprehensiveness in measuring the work ethic has been levied against other scales as well and limits their utility (Furnham, 1984, 1990a, b; McHoskey, 1994).

In an effort to ameliorate the shortcomings in previous attempts to measure the work ethic, Woehr and Miller (1997) and Miller and Woehr (1997) developed the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP). The goal in the development of such a measure was to build on and extend previous measures in an attempt to capture the multidimensionality of the construct. The MWEP is a 65-item measure assessing 7 dimensions related to the work ethic construct. These dimensions are: "*Delay of Gratification*", "*Hard Work*", "*Morality/Ethics*", "*Self-Reliance*", "*Leisure*", "*Wasted Time*", and "*Centrality of Work*". Complete definitions of these dimensions are provided in Table 1.

Originally developed based on a sample of university students, the MWEP has demonstrated good psychometric characteristics including reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. Specifically, Miller and Woehr (1997) report 3 - 4 week test-retest reliabilities of 0.83 - 0.95 and internal consistency coefficient alphas of 0.78 - 0.89 for the dimensions of work ethic. With regards to construct-related validity the MWEP demonstrated discriminant relationships with personality, cognitive ability, and manifest needs. Lastly, the criterion-related validity of the MWEP was evaluated by relating it to academic effort indices pertinent to the university student sample. The MWEP was shown to be significantly related to

hours studying per week (0.21), hours watching TV per week (0.36), hours in extracurricular activities per week (0.26), and classes missed (0.30).

Table 1.

Dimension definitions for the 7 work ethic dimensions assessed by the MWEP.

Dimension:	Definition:
Hard Work	Belief in the virtues of hard work.
Self-Reliance	Striving for independence in one's daily work.
Leisure	Pro-leisure attitudes and beliefs in activities that serve a rejuvenating function.
Centrality of Work	Belief in work for work's sake and the importance of work.
Morality/Ethics	Believing in a just and moral existence.
Delay of Gratification	Orientation toward the future; the postponement of rewards.
Wasted Time	Attitudes and beliefs reflecting active and productive use of time.

Present Study

Given the previous evaluations of the MWEP and the potential for use as a screening measure among Air Force enlisted personnel, the objective of this study was to empirically determine the extent to which the psychometric properties of the MWEP that have been found with a university student sample would generalize to Air Force enlisted personnel. Measurement stability across the samples would allow for greater confidence with regards to measurement equivalence and provide an initial indication of the viability of the MWEP for use in the Air Force.

As noted, the primary objective of the present study was to compare the psychometric characteristics of the MWEP with Air Force personnel relative to the original student development sample. This comparison focused on (1) the mean score levels on each dimension, (2) score variability for each dimension, (3) the reliability for each dimension, and (4) the overall pattern of correlations among dimensions. If the MWEP functions similarly across the two samples no differences in dimension variability, dimension reliability, or the overall pattern of correlations among dimensions should be found. However, differences in mean levels on each dimension are likely given the actual differences across the two samples. That is, the student sample represents 18 to 22-year-old college students. Alternately, the Air Force sample represents an 18 to 22-year-old non-college bound sample. It is likely that actual differences in work ethic attitudes and beliefs exist across the two groups. Such differences would be reflected in mean dimension score differences.

METHOD

University Participants.

The university student sample comprised 598 participants (52% female and 48% male). Subject participation was voluntary and subjects received partial course credit for taking part in the study.

Air Force Participants.

Participants in the present study were 268 Air Force enlisted personnel that participated in the study during Basic Military Training (BMT). The participants were 95% male and 5% female. Further, 71% were White, 15% Black, 8% Hispanic, 4% Asian, and 2% Other. Mean age of the participants was 19.5 years of age and ranged from 18 to 35.

Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) Measure.

The MWEP was originally developed as a 65-item paper-and-pencil measure. The measure requires responses to items on a 5 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). In order to facilitate data collection in the present study the MWEP was included as part of a computer-administered battery of questionnaires. Thus a computer-administered version of the MWEP was developed. Although computer-administered this version was highly similar to the paper-and-pencil version. Both items and response options were displayed in the same manner in both forms. Participants were asked to respond to each of the items via the numbers on the computer keyboard.

Procedure.

The MWEP was administered as part of an extensive battery of computer-administered questionnaires completed in a single 4-hour session during the first week of BMT. Subjects were seated at individual computer terminals and given the measures. Administration of the measures was counterbalanced across experimental sessions.

RESULTS

As noted, comparison of the MWEP in the two samples focused on 1) the mean score levels on each dimension, 2) score variability for each dimension, 3) the reliability for each dimension, and 4) the overall pattern of correlations among dimensions. Mean scores for each of the 7 work ethic dimensions for both the Air Force and student samples are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.

Means and standard deviations for the 7 work ethic dimensions for both the Student and Air Force Samples.

	Student N = 598	Sample	Air Force N = 268	Sample	
Dimension:	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
Centrality of Work	24.34	6.04	20.79	6.03	8.01*
Delay of Gratification	16.95	4.52	14.08	4.18	8.85*
Hard Work	22.09	5.86	16.81	5.45	12.52*
Leisure	28.63	5.86	31.50	5.81	-6.68*
Morality/Ethics	16.08	4.45	13.90	3.21	8.15*
Self-Reliance	26.11	6.88	24.84	6.79	2.51
Wasted Time	19.96	4.71	16.10	4.34	11.41*

* $p < .01$.

Tests for differences between the mean scores for each dimension are also presented in Table 2. These results indicate significant mean differences for all dimensions except the self-reliance dimension. Further, means are higher for the student sample than for the Air Force sample for all dimensions except the leisure dimension. Thus, the student sample had significantly higher mean scores for the centrality of work, delay of gratification, hard work, morality/ethics, and wasted time dimensions. The Air Force sample had a significantly higher mean score on the leisure dimension and no significant difference was for the self-reliance dimension.

Table 3 provides the results of a comparison of the variance of each dimension across samples. These results indicate no significant differences for any of the dimensions across samples except morality/ethics. For the morality/ethics dimension there is significantly less variability in scores for the Air Force sample than for the student sample.

Table 3.
Test for equality of variances across student and Air Force Samples.

Dimension	Student Sample	Air Force	Levine's	Test for
	Variance	Sample Variance	F	Equality of Variances Significance
Centrality of Work	36.48	36.36	.088	.767
Delay of Gratification	20.43	17.47	2.60	.107
Hard Work	34.33	29.70	1.173	.279
Leisure	34.33	33.76	.187	.665
Morality/ethics	19.80	10.30	26.301	.000
Self-Reliance	47.33	46.10	.136	.713
Wasted Time	22.18	18.84	1.586	.208

Dimension reliabilities (coefficient α) for both samples are presented in Table 4. Examination of these results indicates no differences in dimension reliabilities across samples except for the morality/ethics dimension. Specifically, all dimension reliabilities are within .02 of each other across samples except for the morality/ethics dimension for which the reliability is substantially lower in the Air Force sample.

Table 4.
Test for equality of reliabilities across student and Air Force Samples.

Dimension	Student Sample Reliability	Air Force Sample Reliability
Centrality of Work	.84	.85
Delay of Gratification	.79	.78
Hard Work	.85	.87
Leisure	.87	.87
Morality/ethics	.78	.55
Self-Reliance	.89	.86
Wasted Time	.79	.77

Finally, the dimension intercorrelations for both the Air Force and student samples are presented in Table 5. In order to assess the extent to which the dimension intercorrelations differed across samples, we used LISREL 8.14 (Joreskog & Sorbom, 1993) to provide an overall test of the equivalence of the 2 correlation matrices. Specifically, we built a model in which correlations among the 7 work ethic dimensions were set equal to the student sample based correlations and the correlations for the Air Force sample were constrained to be equal to those from the student sample. Using this approach, the overall model fit indices derived from the LISREL analyses provide an indication of the overall equality of the correlations across samples. Results of this analysis are provided in Table 6 and indicate that the two sets of correlations are generally equivalent.

Table 5.
Work ethic dimension intercorrelations for the student and Air Force samples.

	Student	Sample					
Dimensions:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Centrality of Work	1.0						
2. Delay of Gratification	.38	1.0					
3. Hard Work	.33	.33	1.0				
4. Leisure	-.47	-.12	-.08	1.0			
5. Morality/Ethics	.17	.25	.22	.08	1.0		
6. Self-Reliance	.20	.21	.38	.10	.13	1.0	
7. Wasted Time	.56	.40	.38	-.28	.21	.32	1.0

	Air Force	Sample					
Dimensions:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Centrality of Work	1.0						
2. Delay of Gratification	.52	1.0					
3. Hard Work	.48	.56	1.0				
4. Leisure	-.44	-.26	-.23	1.0			
5. Morality/Ethics	.34	.44	.48	-.16	1.0		
6. Self-Reliance	.20	.11	.23	-.02	.18	1.0	
7. Wasted Time	.62	.55	.59	-.34	.46	.26	1.0

Student Sample $N = 598$. All correlations are significant ($p < .01$).

Air Force Sample $N = 268$. All correlations greater than .17 are significant ($p < .01$).

Table 6.

Goodness of fit indices for the test of intercorrelation equivalence.

χ^2	df	χ^2/df	RMSEA	GFI	NFI	CFI	RFI
72.30	42	1.72	.04	.92	.95	.98	.95

DISCUSSION

The present study presents an examination of the psychometric properties of the Multidimensional Work Ethic Profile (MWEP) developed by Michael Miller and David Woehr (Miller & Woehr, 1997; Woehr & Miller, 1997). The MWEP is a 65-item measure of work ethic based on previous research and literature focusing on work ethic and job performance. An important characteristic of the MWEP is that it assesses 7 conceptually and empirically distinct facets of the work ethic construct. Originally developed based on a sample of university students, the MWEP has demonstrated good psychometric characteristics including reliability and convergent and discriminant validity. Further, the MWEP has been suggested as a potentially valuable screening tool with Air Force enlisted personnel. The purpose of the present study was to provide a preliminary evaluation of the measure among Air Force enlisted personnel. Results indicate that the measure does in fact demonstrate similar psychometric characteristics among Air Force enlisted personnel as with the original developmental sample. The MWEP provides reliable and valid measures of multiple dimensions underlying the work ethic construct. These results indicate that the MWEP may be a useful screening tool for Air Force Personnel.

Specifically, results of the present study found no differences across samples for the dimension variances, reliabilities, and intercorrelations across dimensions. One exception to these findings was for the "*Morality/Ethics*" dimension. For this dimension the results indicated significantly less variance as well as substantially lower reliability with the Air Force sample relative to the student sample. One possible explanation for this finding may lie in differences in the work settings of the two samples. That is, the student sample was assessed in a non-job setting while the Air Force sample was assessed in an actual job setting. It is likely that the items comprising the "*Morality/Ethics*" dimension are fairly transparent and actual job incumbents may not respond as truthfully as non-incumbents. This would result in the restricted variance found in the Air Force sample. This reduced variance would in turn result in a lower reliability estimate. Counter to this explanation, however, was our finding that the mean response for the "*Morality/Ethics*" dimension was actually significantly lower in the Air Force sample relative to the student sample. If the items were relatively transparent and the incumbent sample was simply responding in a more socially desirable manner then one would expect a higher mean score. It is difficult at this point to determine the exact reasons for the differences found across

samples for this dimension. The lack of difference across the other, more work-related dimensions, however, is encouraging.

The results of this study do indicate significant mean score differences for 6 of the 7 dimensions across samples. These differences are not unexpected and do not call into question the measurement equivalence of the MWEP in either sample. Rather, these differences are to a certain extent consistent with expected differences between the two samples. The student sample represents young adults attending college. Alternately, the Air Force sample represents young adults not attending college but directly entering the work force. Thus, differences in work ethic scores most likely reflect actual differences between samples.

The measurement equivalence shown between student and non-student samples in this study provides substantial support for the use of the MWEP in different populations. Indeed, 6 of the 7 dimensions showed similar variances, reliabilities, and dimension intercorrelations. These results provide strong evidence for the generalizability of the MWEP for use with non-student samples.

FUTURE RESEARCH

The prediction of job performance is one of the benchmarks of industrial psychology. Though the field has relied primarily on cognitive ability measures to predict performance, it has also pursued the use of alternative predictors (Arvey & Sackett, 1993). One of the most prevalent alternative predictors has been personality variables (Adler, 1996; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Goffin, Rothstein, & Johnston, 1996; Hogan, Hogan, & Roberts, 1996; Hormann & Maschke, 1996; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991). Though measures of personality have not resulted in adverse impact, many researchers have found a low relationship with actual criterion measures of job performance (Ones, Mount, Barrick, & Hunter, 1994). Another potential problem is that personality variables may not function in a linear fashion. Attitudinal variables such as work ethic may bridge the gap between cognitive ability and personality variables.

The results of this study demonstrate that one such attitudinal measure, the MWEP, demonstrates good psychometric characteristics in two diverse samples. This suggests that the MWEP is a potentially valuable pragmatic measure for either sample. Certainly, the next step is to examine the predictive utility of the MWEP in an Air Force context. A proposed avenue of research for the future would be an examination of the relationship of the work ethic to technical school training success, job performance, and tenure in the Air Force. This could be achieved through the administration of the MWEP to enlisted personnel while in BMT and following up on their respective progress in the Air Force. The criteria in this example might be technical school final grade, performance evaluations while at the duty station, and fulfillment of enlistment tour requirements.

REFERENCES

- Adler, S. (1996). Personality and work behaviour: Exploring the linkages. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 45, 207-224.
- Aldag, R. J. & Brief, A. P. (1975). Some correlates of work values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 757-760.
- Arvey, R. D., & Sackett, P. R. (1993). Fairness in selection: Current developments and perspectives. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big 5 personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 44, 1-44.
- Blau, G. J. (1987). Using a person-environment fit model to predict job involvement and organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 240-257.
- Blood, M. R. (1969). Work values and job satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 53, 456-459.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bouma, G. D. (1973). Beyond Lenski: A critical review of recent "Protestant Ethic" research. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 141-155.
- Byrne, E. F. (1990). Work, inc.: A philosophical inquiry. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol 1, 2nd ed., pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel selection in organizations (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Carver, C. S. (1989). How should multifaceted personality constructs be tested? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 577-585.

- Charlton, W., Mallinson, T., & Oakeshott, R. (1986). The Christian response to industrial capitalism. London: Sheed & Ward.
- Cherrington, D. J. (1980). The work ethic: Working values and values that work. New York: AMACOM.
- Dubin, R. (1963). Industrial worker's worlds: A study of the 'central life interests' of industrial workers. In E. O. Smigel (Ed.), Work and Leisure (pp. 53-72). New Haven: College and University Press.
- Fine, R. (1983). The Protestant ethic and the analytic ideal. Political Psychology, 4, 245-264.
- Furnham, A. (1984). The Protestant work ethic: A review of the psychological literature. European Journal of Social Psychology, 14, 87-104.
- Furnham, A. (1990a). The Protestant work ethic: The psychology of work-related beliefs and behaviours. London: Routledge.
- Furnham, A. (1990b). A content, correlational, and factor analytic study of seven questionnaire measures of the Protestant work ethic. Human Relations, 43, 383-399.
- Gilbert, J. B. (1977). Work without salvation: America's intellectuals and industrial alienation, 1880-1910. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Giorgi, L., & Marsh, C. (1990). The Protestant work ethic as a cultural phenomenon. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 499-517.
- Goffin, R. D., Rothstien, M. G., & Johnson, N. G. (1996). Personality testing and the assessment center: Incremental validity for managerial selection. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 746-756.
- Green, A. W. (1968). Sociology: An analysis of life in modern society. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Heaven, P. C. L. (1989). Structure and personality correlates of the Protestant work ethic among women. Personality and Individual Differences, 10, 101-104.
- Ho, R., & Lloyd, J. I. (1984). Development of an Australian work ethic scale. Australian Psychologist, 19, 321-332.
- Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. American Psychologist, 51, 469-477.

- Horman, H. J., & Maschke, P. (1996). On the relation between personality and job performance of airline pilots. International Journal of Aviation, 6, 171-178.
- Joreskog, K. G., & Sorbom, D. (1993). LISREL 8: User's Reference Guide. Chicago: Scientific Software.
- Khaleque, A. (1992). Work values, attitudes and performance of industrial workers in Bangladesh. Social Indicators Research, 27, 187-195.
- Kidron, A. (1978). Work values and organizational commitment. Academy of Management Journal, 21, 239-247.
- Lehmann, H. (1993). The rise of capitalism: Weber versus Sombart. In H. Lehmann & G. Roth (Eds.), Weber's Protestant ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts (pp. 195-208). Washington, D. C.: Cambridge University Press.
- Lessnoff, M. H. (1994). The spirit of capitalism and the Protestant ethic: An Enquiry into the Weber thesis. Brookfield, VT: E. Elgar.
- Maccoby, M. (1983). The managerial work ethic in America. In J. Barbash, R. J. Lapman, S. A. Levitan, & G. Tyler (Eds.), The work ethic--A critical analysis (pp. 183-196). Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- McHoskey, J. W. (1994). Factor structure of the Protestant work ethic scale. Personality and Individual Differences, 17, 49-52.
- Miller, M. J., & Woehr, D. J. (1997). Work ethic: The development and evaluation of a multidimensional measure. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Mirels, H. L., & Garrett, J. B. (1971). The Protestant ethic as a personality variable. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36, 40-44.
- Morrow, P. C., & McElroy, J. C. (1987). Work commitment and job satisfaction over three career stages. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 30, 330-346.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 79, 475-480.
- Nelson, B. (1973). Weber's Protestant ethic: Its origins, wanderings, and foreseeable future. In C. Glock & P. Hammond (Eds.), Beyond the classics (pp. 71-130). New York: Harper & Row.
- Nord, W. R., Brief, A. P., Atieh, J. M., & Doherty, E. M. (1988). Work values and the conduct

of organizational behavior. Research in Organizational Behavior, 10, 1-42.

Oates, W. (1971). Confessions of a workaholic: The facts about work addiction. New York: World Publishing Company.

Ones, D. S., Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Hunter, J. E. (1994). Personality and job performance: Critique of Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein (1991) meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 47, 147-156.

Orpen, C. (1986). Work values as a moderator of the effect of participation in budget-setting on employee satisfaction and performance. Psychological Studies, 31, 42-47.

Pascarella, P. (1984). The new achievers: Creating a modern work ethic. New York: Free Press.

Poggi, G. (1983). Calvinism and the capitalist spirit: Max Weber's Protestant ethic. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Randall, D. M. & Cote, J. A. (1991). Interrelationships of work commitment constructs. Work and Occupations, 18, 194-211.

Ray, J. J. (1982). The Protestant ethic in Australia. Journal of Social Psychology, 116, 127-138.

Saal, F. E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 63, 53-61.

Stone, E. F. (1975). Job scope, job satisfaction, and the Protestant ethic: A study of enlisted men in the U.S. Navy. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 7, 215-234.

Stone, E. F. (1976). The moderating effect of work-related values on the job scope-job satisfaction relationship. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 147-167.

Tang, T. L. -P. (1993). A factor analytic study of the Protestant work ethic. The Journal of Social Psychology, 133, 109-111.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. Personnel Psychology, 44, 703-742.

Wanous, J. P. (1974). Individual differences and reactions to job characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 616-622.

Weber, M. (1958). The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons

Woehr, D. J. & Miller, M. J. (1997, April). The meaning and measurement of work ethic. Paper presented at the annual Southeastern Industrial/Organizational Psychology Meeting, Atlanta, GA.

Wollack, S., Goodale, J. G., Wijting, J. P., & Smith, P.C. (1971). Development of the Survey of Work Values. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55, 331-338.